IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE SIDE

LETTER PATENT APPEAL NO.48 OF 2006
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.9012 OF 2004

Girish Keshavrao Hadke ...Appellant
Vs.

University of Pune & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH
LETTER PATENT APPEAL NO.49 OF 2006
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.9027 OF 2004

Umesh Sambhaji Zapke ...Appellant
Vs.
University of Pune & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH
LETTER PATENT APPEAL NO.50 OF 2006
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.9026 OF 2004

Vaibhav Madhusudan Limaye ...Appellant
Vs.
University of Pune & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH
LETTER PATENT APPEAL NO.51 OF 2006
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.9029 OF 2004

Sanjay Laxman Shinde ...Appellant
Vs.
University of Pune & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

LETTER PATENT APPEAL NO.52 OF 2006
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.9030 OF 2004

Shekhar Ramesh Joshi ...Appellant
Vs.
University of Pune & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH
LETTER PATENT APPEAL NO.53 OF 2006
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.9014 OF 2004

Milind Bhaskar Waghmre ...Appellant

Vs.
University of Pune & Ors. ...Respondents

Mr.A.V.Anturkar with Sugandh B. Deshmukh for Appellants
Mr. R.M.Patne, A.G.P. for Respondents

CORAM: R.M.S.KHANDEPARKAR &
SMT.ROSHAN DALVI, JJ.
DATED: 3RD APRIL, 2006

P.C.

1. Heard. Since undisputedly the appointments of the appellants were made under a scheme and it is not in dispute that the said scheme has come to an end, the termination of the services of the appellants cannot be found fault with. Considering the same, the impugned order passed by the learned single Judge rejecting the challenge by the Petitioners cannot be found fault with, and therefore, there is no case made out for interference in the Letters Patent Appeal.

2. Undoubtedly, the appellants in the Writ Petitions filed before the learned Single Judge have also prayed as under :-

> . " That this Honourable Court be pleased to issue a writ certiorari or writ in the nature of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, direction or order under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, quashing and setting aside the judgment and order passed by the learned Presiding Officer, Pune/Shivaji University and the

College Appellate Tribunal, Pune University Campus, Pune-7 in Appeal No.72 of 2004 dated 1st October 2004, and be pleased to quash and set aside the termination of the service of the Petitioner by the Respondent No.1."

3. Needless to say that the learned Single Judge has not dealt with the said aspect of the matter, and rightly so, as the same cannot be dealt with by the learned Single Judge, the matter in that regard will have to be dealt with by the Division Bench. In the result, therefore, all the appeals stand rejected. No order as to costs.

(SMT. ROSHAN DALVI, J.) (R.M.S.KHANDEPARKAR,J.)